

A

S P E E C H

DELIVERED AT THE

New England Anti-Slavery Convention,

WEDNESDAY MORNING, MAY 26, 1858.

BY THEODORE PARKER.

REVISED BY THE AUTHOR.

BOSTON:

WILLIAM L. KENT & COMPANY, 3 STATE STREET.

1858.

COLLEGE
LIBRARY

A. L. K.
W. L. K. & Co.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858, by
WM. L. KENT AND COMPANY,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

Geo. C. Rand & Avery, Printers, 3 Cornhill, Boston.

251437

S P E E C H.

Mr. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: On the matter of Slavery there is great confusion of thought, just now, in the American State and the American Church. Monarchic and Oligarchic Europe is at war with this institution. The British Teuton has driven it out from his soil; his kindred, the Dutch, the Scandinavians, the Germans and Austrians, have done the same. The French Celts allow no property in man, and Napoleon's attempt to restore the doctrine and practice of the Dark Ages, is sure to fail. Even the Russian despotism attacks the principle of bondage. Alexander will liberate 30,000,000 Caucasian slaves, and in less than twelve years the last footprint of the serf will be covered up by the new humane agriculture of Russia. Turkey cannot long hold out against the steady progress of mankind.

But, in America, the Democratic party thinks slavery is "indispensable to good government," and is "the normal condition of one seventh part of the people." The Republican party has naught to say against property in man, but allows a minority to own a majority in South Carolina. The American Church is the stanchest supporter of American slavery. To the American Politician, slavery is a "Republican Institution;" to the American Priest, it is doably religious—both a "Jewish" and a "Christian" Dispensation. The Revival of the Ecclesiastical Religion and of the African slave trade go on at the same time; they take sweet counsel together, and walk to the house of their God in company. Years ago, the greatest professional Rhetorician of America, "the Monarch of the Platform," "Orator, Patriot, Sage, Cicero of America, Landator of Washington, Apostle of Charity, High Priest of the Union, and Friend of Mankind," whom "totally mendacious Greece," if she might equal, yet could ne'er surpass in that sophistic art, justified slavery out of the New Testament, and declared his readiness to buckle on his knapsack, shoulder his musket, and march

South, to defend the masters who make merchandise of men, against their insurgent chattels. I know not whether Mr. Everett said that under the influence of "an anodyne" or a stimulant; but neither the public and immediate reply of Southern Congressmen, nor the private rebuke of more distant Jefferson—then so near the grave—has yet led this "Patriot, Statesman, Philanthropist," to renounce that statement in his maiden speech! Noble Charles Sumner, who "was wounded for our transgressions," in a foreign land seeks the quiet and health he cannot find in this. He bears with him the thanks and the prayers of religious men; but his sails are filled with the curses of the Northern Democrats, the Southern hiss and sneer, the contemptuous laugh of Richard Yeadon, and the *remarkable language* of Mr. Everett, their rhetorical coadjutor. "Remarkable language"! Is there not a shorter name for it, also wholly Saxon?

This ecclesiastical and political confusion is amazing. Can you and I do something to end it? Let us try. So I will ask your attention to some **THOUGHTS ON THE RELATION OF SLAVERY TO A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT.**

Man is gregarious by instinct; like sheep and deer, he cannot live save in flocks and herds. Solitary, he perishes. He is social by reflective will—consciously making terms of alliance with his fellows, and shaping the form of his community to suit his needs, which vary from age to age. So in all lands men group together, the wildest and also the most enlightened; for this gregarious nature of man appears in all stages of his development—lowest and highest. But, while the gregarious savage makes only a herd of men who are driven together by necessity, or drawn by their unreflective instinct, and are dominated over by the strongest, who, though he protects the feeble, also robs them of their natural rights as

pay for his help; the reflective civilized man shapes his society so as to secure the Natural Rights of each; the ablest man rules, but it is for the joint good of him and all; and he does not take his pay by robbing them of their rights, but rather do they voluntarily give him the sweeter compensation of Honor and Gratitude. Thus are both parties materially and spiritually profited by the alliance.

There are two great things to be considered in human History.

1. The Individuality of each man. He is an integer, a Unit of Humanity, impenetrable; his humanity must be respected.

2. The Sociality of all men: they must cohere into one symmetric whole. There is a mutuality of social need: the strong man requires the weak men as the weak needs the strong. As the doctor wants patients, the speaker hearers, the herdsman cattle, the farmer land; so and not less does the great man need the little. If they require him as means for their protection and guidance, so does he need them as means for his development. Neither greatness nor littleness can be alone.

Now, the Individual reaches his proper growth only in society—with the communion of his fellows. A great character cannot be built up alone; no more than a great temple. A hermit constructs no pyramid; he achieves no great, noble manhood. The man running alone goes nowhere, and is yet soon lost. The more perfect and complete the form of society, the more complete and perfect are the individual men whom it brings up. Society is to be tested by the men it breeds; that is the best which produces the best and most superior individuals.

The Substance of Society depends on the automatic gregarious instinct which groups men into flocks and herds; this is always the same. But the Form of Society depends upon the will and intelligence of the controlling men. In the human body there are Voluntary Actions—eating, speaking, drinking, and the like; but also Involuntary Actions, which go on independent of the individual will—such as breathing, the circulation of the blood, and the like. So in the great companies of men, there are automatic actions of the community, tribe, nation, or mankind, which are not purposed by individuals, nor even forethought in the consciousness of any special person; these are to the Body Social what breathing and similar things are to the

Body Individual; they belong to social Instinct, not social Will.

It is the business of statesmen to regulate the action of both the voluntary and the automatic forces of the collective mass, and make such a Form of Society as shall produce noble men, in the greatest number and of the best kind.

For the development of Society there must be Government; that is, the social body must observe certain Rules of Conduct, called Laws, whereto all persons are held subject. These may be Customs which men hit upon, and become wonted to—and they are the consequences of an experiment, the product of history, the record of the past: or they may be the Ideal Aim^a of the people or the rulers, which anticipate experience, and are intended to shape and control the future—not representing experiments tried, but experiments in process. One is Common Law, made, not enacted—a path worn by the people's feet; it is a public highway because men walk there. The other is Statute Law, enacted by conscious will, not made by actual practice,—a road laid out intentionally by the surveyors; the people walk there because it is a public highway.

These twofold laws may be just—conformable to the Constitution of the Universe, the natural Rule of Right, and the reflection thereof in the moral sense of mankind: or unjust—contrary to that Higher Law of God and the conscience of man.

Human experience shows that all governmental power of one man over others is abused for the advantage of the holder thereof, and the hurt of those he holds it over, unless they have abundant means to keep him in check, and prevent his tyranny. Irresponsible governors make bad laws. The private conscience of the ruler is seldom so good a check on his selfishness as the rod and the axe in the hands of the governed.

All society must have its government, that is, Rules of Conduct, and Conductors to see that they are kept—Abstract Rules, Concrete Rulers. The substance of government consists in these two, and is always the same: but the forms thereof vary much from land to land, and age to age; yet may they be thus grossly summed in three:

I. Monarchy—The One-Man Power; government over all, but by one, and often in

practice it turns out to be chiefly for the sake of that one.

II. Oligarchy—The Few-Men Power; government over all, but by a few, and often in practice it turns out to be chiefly for the sake of that few.

III. DEMOCRACY—The All-Men Power; government over all, by all, and for the sake of all. Yet, practically, it must be government by the Majority, and in fact, it often turns out to be chiefly for the advantage of that majority. As a general rule, no majority, no small body of men, no individual man, is ever trusted with unlimited power over others, but he abuses it—for his gain, to their loss. Such is the friction in all social machinery.

None of these three types anywhere appears simple; all governments are mixed. The most despotic monarchy is partly oligarchic, for King One cannot dispense with the help of the superior men, and if some of these be wiser and skilfuller than he, ere long it is they who govern, while he only reigns. And these able men, the Few, cannot prevent the automatic action of the social power in the great mass of men, who will instinctively, nay, who must of necessity, walk in new paths of their own, spite of the many statute roads that perplex the land, and the command to walk in them. Thus do the Democratic elements spring up, wild flowers of humanity, where Oligarchs and Kings scattered only the privileged seed, collected by authority out of the court-house, and appointed to be sown in gardens.

So, on the other side, the most Democratic form of government will contain oligarchic and monarchic elements. The Democracy cannot enfeeble the powerful man, strong by nature, no position can make him weak; he will rule men just in proportion to his power, and if wicked also, will rule them for his apparent gain and to their real loss. So companies of rich men, powerful by money, or of educated men, powerful by knowledge, will do much to control the majority who have only their naked numbers to rely on,—must be counted, and not also weighed. If they likewise are wicked men, or but commonly selfish, they will sway the people with an oligarchic misrule. Thus, even in the national field “an enemy,”—so men call what they do not comprehend,—is continually sowing these tares among the wheat, which, though they suck the ground and check the grain, must yet not be pulled up, lest worse ill fall out thereby.

Let not names deceive us: all monarchies

have spots which are like democracies; and popular governments have institutions, at least practices, which are oligarchic, and even despotical. There are many points of resemblance between the Turkish Despotism, the most rearward government in Europe, and our own Democracy, which we think the foremost in the world. Still, not misled by names, define the governments by their centre, where they are most distinct and faithful to their idea, not by their circumference, where they meet and blend, and you find these three—the One-Man Power, the Few-Men Power, the All-Men Power,—government for the sake of one, of a few, or of all. At present, no one of these has combined the separate excellences of all the rest.

Now, man is a Progressive Being. This is true of the Individual, who reaches his earthen limit of attainment in a short life, and dies; it is also true of mankind, which never dies, nor reaches that limit of attainment. You and I start as babies, and grow up to manhood;—Mankind starts from naked, ignorant wildness—the babyhood of the human race—and grows up till the hindmost nations are what we hear of in New Holland and Patagonia, while the foremost are what we see in Boston, London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome. The whole of human History is evidence of this Progress. But even now, it depends chiefly on the automatic actions of mankind; once it was controlled entirely by them. It was an instinct, not a will, a thought, or even a conscious wish. Man was progressive, as the beaver was constructive, and the squirrel acquisitive. As you and I grow up from babyhood, and, though we take no thought, yet add whole cubits to our stature, so has Mankind made progress from wildness to the enlightened condition of the foremost people to-day.

This Progress of Mankind may be thus summed up. It consists of three things:

I. The development of Personal powers in the Individual man—the ultimate atom of society.

II. The development of Social powers in the gregarious mass. This is done by combining men into companies:—first, there is the binary union of Him and Her, and at length the multitudinous compounding of four hundred millions, despotically welded into a Chinese empire,—which is a stiff, unwieldly bar of iron; or of thirty-two sovereign States, federatively connected into one American Com-

monwealth — which is a chain of many links, alike flexible and strong. To develop these powers of Society, there must be National Unity of Action — the whole mass working as a well-harnessed team of men ; and also Individual Variety of Action—each man enjoying his own personal freedom of nature.

III. The acquisition of Power over the material world, which comes as a consequence of this personal and social development. This Power appears in two forms.

(1.) That of Science ; which is ability to know the forces of Nature in their present and past condition, and to foretell their future condition.

(2.) That of Art ; which is ability to control the forces of Nature, and make them productive of Use and Beauty for our own purposes.

This Progress is generic of Mankind — not an exceptional, but an instantial fact. The Human Race, taken as a whole, never goes back, never stands still. But yet, this advance of Mankind has hitherto depended mainly on the automatic forces of Human Nature ; it has been and still is directed less by the foresight of man than the Providence of God acting through the great instincts of individual improvement and social progress. Mankind could not prevent it ; no more than all the babies in Boston could prevent themselves from growing up to manhood. But while this progress is continual in Mankind, dependent on organic causes which are out of our reach, there are yet fluctuations in individual men, and in particular nations, that stand still, or even go back. All round us there are good men who come to their growth, and stop there, then decline, next die ; it is the course of nature. But there are likewise evil men, who by their vice debar themselves from natural and healthy growth, and perish immaturely old, and die not half grown. The same is true of States. I do not know that any nation has died a natural death of old age. Many adopt evil forms of government, with such ecclesiastical, political, social and domestic institutions as prevent them from advancing, force them to stand still, and so to perish. Here I notice two things.

I. In all progressive nations there is a continual bettering both of the Form and the Substance of Government.

1. In its Form. The Monarchy tends to Oligarchy, the Oligarchy to Democracy. There is a popularization of Government, a

progressive diffusion of power. Centralization yields to local Self-Government. This improvement may go on by that regular slope we call Development, — where the continuity of historic action never seems to be broke ; or by those irregular stairs we name Revolution, which seems to interrupt the historic continuity of action, though it does not.

2. In its Substance. There is a moralization of Government ; statutes and customs conform more to the Constitution of the Universe ; the roads laid out and the paths walked in, come nearer to an arc of that great circle which is the shortest distance between two points on the human sphere ; the natural Rule of Right becomes the Rule of Conduct, and secures Justice, which is the interest of each and of all, the point common to me and mankind, to men and God.

This change is noticeable in all progressive nations, just as clearly as the swelling of buds, the opening of flowers, and the shooting forth of leaves, are distinctive of spring.

II. In a regressive or a stationary people, the opposite takes place ; there is a continuous worsening of institutions.

1. There is a change in the Form of Government,— Democracy tends to Oligarchy, that to Monarchy ; local self-government yields to centralization ; political power is monopolized ; Government by All shrinks to Government by a Few, that to Government by One.

2. The change in the Substance is of the same sort. Statutes and customs conform less to natural Justice ; the Rule of Violence becomes the Rule of Conduct.

This change is noticeable in all decaying nations. It is like the fall of the leaf and the tightening of the bark when winter sets severely in.

At this day, the Caucasians are the most progressive people on earth. Their most advanced and advancing nations are the Celtic-French, who have made vast strides within a hundred years, and though now checked in the march, they will not stop long ; and the various Teutonic people. Among the latter, the English and Americans are types of progress, representative nations. Not only have they the Instinct of Progress, and advance by their automatic action ; but also the Idea, and improve by their conscious Will. They look forward to the end, and devise means to help them thitherward. No where has there been such advance in two hundred and fifty years.

Think of North America at the settlement of Jamestown, in Virginia, in 1608; and of the United States at the settlement of Sumner, in Kansas, in 1858! What growth of numbers, of wealth; what improvement of Institutions—ecclesiastical, political, social, domestic! What instinct of progress there is in the American People! What speculative desire for it, what resolute will, what practical action!

We have the foremost form of Political Institutions, with local self-government as the Ideal; we take that for the equivalent of Freedom, while centralized government by others we look on as the same with Slavery.

This progress appears in many things—in Agriculture, Mining, Manufactures, Commerce—the four grand divisions of the Business world. You find it in all departments of thought: even theology is amenable to improvement; Unitarians, Universalists, Spiritualists, carry on the historic continuity of development, which reaches from the flight of Moses out of Egypt, down to the meeting of this Anti-Slavery Convention.

Since this century began, there has been a great progress in the Political Institutions of all the Northern States. Constitutions become more democratic; customs and statutes are more just; condensed, vicarious power is broken up and diffused abroad to many centres of local self-government. This progressive bettering of the Form and Substance of such institutions goes on with accelerated velocity.

But at the South, you do not meet with a similar improvement; nay, you often find the opposite. For Slavery has there a permanent welcome. That shoot from the Upas tree of foreign barbarism has been imported and naturalized there; with its pernicious shade it hinders the growth of the fair plant of Liberty, once set even in that soil. What was once a transient exception in the history of the North, is become a typical institution there; it is a guide-board instance, pointing to the central peculiarity of the South. Under her control, the Federal Government also retrogrades in the same way, through the influence of the same exceptional cause. From the latter, I select three examples.

1. In 1793, the Federal Government took slavery under its special protection, passed the first Fugitive Slave Law, according to Property in Men a guaranty it never gave to Property in Land or Things. Here it violated both the natural and the constitutional rights of the individual States, and adopted a vicious

centralization of the most dangerous character. In 1836, the Supreme Court,—which is also the purchased creature of the Slave Power,—in the Prigg case, decided that the individual States had neither duties nor rights in this matter; but the United States might kidnap a runaway on any free soil of the individual States. In 1850, by the new Fugitive Slave Bill, the means of kidnapping were provided at the expense of the General Government, and man-stealing was made easy. In 1857, in the Dred Scott case, the Supreme Court decided that a colored man had no rights which the people were bound to respect, for he was not a citizen of the United States,—of course, he could not receive a passport enabling him to travel on the European continent, nor command a merchant vessel, nor claim a citizen's bounty in the fishery, nor preempt a quarter section of the public land, nor exercise any of the other rights of citizenship; yet is he made amenable to all the laws wherof he is thus habitually put to the ban. Two Judges dissented from this iniquitous decision as false in history as unjust in law,—Mr. McLean of Ohio, Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts:—it gives me great pleasure to mention and extol his manly conduct then! This is the first example—what a striding backward in five and sixty years!

2. The Federal Government has taken special pains to acquire new territory, and put this exceptional institution in it. Look at Louisiana and the other States made out of the territory acquired from France; look at Florida, at Texas, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona! What pains does the Government take to spread Slavery! That is the second example.

3. It assumes that Slavery is not only consistent with the nature of a Republic, but is favorable for its development. The Slave Power controls the Government, and continually declares that "free society is a failure;" that "Slavery is indispensable to a Republic." If the present and the past Administration,—I mean, the Presidential and Senatorial Executive, with their manifold subordinates,—are not personally of that opinion, they yet are officially, for all their acts look that way. Witness the attempt to force slavery into Kansas, whose whole brief life has been the history of violent attempts to inoculate her with that disease which even in their youth makes Virginia and the Carolinas decrepit—hindering their increase in men, their acquisition of things,

and degrading their intellectual and moral character. So important does the present Administration think Slavery for political welfare, that it not only allows Kansas, with but 50,000 inhabitants, to come into the Union as a Slave State now, but offers her enormous bribes if she will thus desile her maiden honor; while, if she insists on being a Free State, then shall she have no dowry at all, and shall not enter the national family until she has 93,000 inhabitants, in 1860, or 1864!

These are but three examples; I could count many more. All this wickedness comes from the adoption of Slavery by the Federal Government. Had it done nothing at all about the matter—taken sides with neither Freedom nor Slavery—how different had the nation now been! What if the Government had sided with Freedom! What a nation should we have become! What population, what industry—Agriculture, Mining, Manufactures, Commerce—should we see in the Southern States themselves! what intelligence, what morality!

But, strange as it may seem, the Constitution of the nation contains these words:—"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government." (Art. IV. sec. 4.)

These are not words of idle ceremony; "they are plain without any scruple, and absolute without any saving;" "prudent antiquity included much matter in few words." The only pretended ambiguity is in the words, "Republican form of Government." What do they mean? Is Slavery consistent with a "Republican form of Government," in the constitutional sense of the phrase? If so, then it may spread every where, and include not only black men, but also red men, brown men, yellow men, and white men—for the color is but an accident of the skin, affecting the substance of no man's nature. Nay, it may include the Majority of the People—all except a few masters numerous enough to hold the rest! But if "a Republican form of Government" be hostile to slavery, then, peaceably or forcibly, slavery must go down and perish utterly out of every "State in this Union." The question must now be decided, actually and presently through custom, or prospectively by statute.

It is the People who are to determine what the words mean;—the Legislative, Judiciary and Executive, are but attorneys, having only

delegated and limited powers; while the People are the Proprietors and Sovereigns, with Eminent Domain over the premises of their vassals. The opinion of these attorneys is but advisory and provisional, while the decision of the majority of the People is declaratory and final.

Here, then, come three questions—(1) What is Slavery? (2) What is a Republican form of Government, in the constitutional sense? (3) Is Slavery compatible with a Republican form of Government? Let me say a word on each of the three. The first two are questions of definition, the last of comparison.

I. What is Slavery? I define it by its essence—Slavery is Property in Man. I make Dinah my slave. She is my property—her substance becomes my accident. She is no longer to be counted a person, with free spiritual or bodily individuality; she is a thing—"a chattel, to all intents, uses and purposes whatsoever." Slavery is a condition contrary to Natural Right.

II. What is a "Republican form of Government?" Here the dictionaries will not help us, neither will the private opinions of distinguished men living at the time the Constitution was made; for it is notorious that such men as Franklin, Jefferson, the two Adamses, Washington, Madison, and others, differed very widely on this Ideal Government, indicated and guaranteed by these words. The common rules of interpretation are well known, and must serve us in this as in all other cases. We are to look at the Constitution itself, to interpret its words by reference to the Purpose which the People had in view in making it, and the Principles set forth in any other document of like nature coming from the People. The interpretation of this clause requires only good sense, good faith, good heed, good judgment; there is nothing mysterious in the matter.

I shall seek the means of definition in two documents which are the work of the People of the United States, namely: in the Constitution itself, which is professedly and on its face the act and deed of "the People of the United States," and in the Declaration of Independence, which is equally their free act and deed, though not set forth and published as such in the same manner and form: the Revolutionary War is the People's Vote for accepting the Declaration. I think these two papers are the act of the People of the United

States as no other in our history. Now, the meaning of the words "Republican form of Government" is to be sought in the Constitution itself, though it occurs therein but once; the Declaration affords light to read the Constitution by, and as that is the older, let us look at it first, and then at the Constitution.

i. The Declaration of Independence is the National PROGRAMME OF POLITICAL PRINCIPLES, solemnly prepared and published by the Delegates, and subsequently adopted by the People themselves, as their Rule of Conduct in separating from the mother country, and organizing their own voluntary and automatic powers into a new form of Government, and constructing its institutions. It is solemnly read on all celebrations of Independence in the Northern States, formerly in all the States. You all know the words; here are the principles, which, for convenience, I put into a philosophic form.

1. All men have certain natural and essential Rights; among them, the right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.

2. These Rights are unalienable, except by the misconduct and crime of the possessor thereof. One man cannot alienate another's rights.

3. In respect to these natural and unalienable Rights, all men are equal; with the rich, the educated, men of famous family, these rights are not quantitatively greater, or qualitatively more nice, than with the poor, the ignorant, and men born in the humblest place.

4. Governments are instituted to secure these natural, unalienable and equal Rights to all men.

5. These Governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, that is, from the Majority of the Inhabitants; and accordingly, when the government does not secure them the enjoyment thereof, it is the right of the People to alter or abolish it.

In this Programme of constructive Revolution, the great charter of American Law, these Principles are not referred back to any grant from Parliament or King, to any Statute Law, nor rested on the foundation of any Customs among men, or inductive reasoning of philosophers. They are founded not on Facts of Observation in Human History, but on Facts of Consciousness in human Nature itself. Our fathers said — "We hold these truths to be SELF-EVIDENT." Young Mr. Jefferson furnished the popular words, but the Ideas were of New England, and had been passed upon

in the town meetings of Boston, and other little villages in Massachusetts, whence Franklin and the two noble Adamses took and inspired them into the democratic young man from Virginia. New and strange to the world, where they were to have a great future, they were familiar to New England, where even then they had also a history.

That is the first witness for definition: such his testimony. If the People were to establish such a government as would represent the sense of that document, a "Republican form of Government" must be one which in substance secures to all men their natural, unalienable and equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and in form has the consent of the governed.

ii. The next source is the Constitution of the United States itself. During the war a Confederacy was made, intended to be provisional; but when the Revolution was complete, something more lasting was needed. Institutions must be invented, organized and administered, which should apply the Principles of the Declaration to actual work, and incorporate them into the political life of the People. This could not be done directly by all the People; it must be by a few—the servants of the People. So a scheme of Institutions must be prepared. For that purpose, delegates were appointed in all the States, and a Convention held. They made "the Constitution," and proposed it to the People, who accepted it by rather a small majority of the popular vote. The servants who wrought it out confessed that it had great defects. Such was the opinion of Franklin, the ablest man in America—of Washington, the next most distinguished: many leading men in the individual States, who voted for its acceptance, disliked many things in it. Such was the case with Samuel Adams and John Hancock, then the two most influential men in Massachusetts. But it was accepted as "good for the present distress." There is much foolish and hypocritical talk now about the "sacredness of the Constitution," which would sound a little contemptible to Hancock and Adams, to Washington and Franklin.

The Constitution is a POWER OF ATTORNEY, by which the People of the United States, authorize their servants to do certain matters and things pertaining to the government of America—that is, to invent, organize and administer such Institutions as shall introduce the Principles of the Declaration into

the actual political life of the People. All officers of the United States are sworn to keep the Constitution—i. e., to conform to that Power of Attorney, to do what it commands—of course, the agents of the People have no official authority, except what they receive under that Power of Attorney.

Now, this Power of Attorney contains two parts: (1,) The Preamble, and, (2,) the Purview, the Seven Articles making up the body of the document.

1. The Preamble is a **PROGRAMME OF PURPOSES**, telling the People's agents what matters and things they are authorized and instructed to do. Commonly the preamble to a statute merely recites the historical occasion of that enactment; but the preamble to this solemn act of the whole People is quite different—it declares the Motive, the *Animus propter quem*, and the Purpose, the *Finem usque ad quem*. These are the words: "To form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common Defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

These are the things to be done. Nothing else is commanded or even permitted; and it is elsewhere expressly declared that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are secured to the States respectively, or to the People." (Amendment, Art. X.) And again: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the People." (Amendment, Art. IX.)

This Programme of Purposes is unitary, in harmony with itself; and also consistent with the Programme of Principles in the Declaration.

2. The Seven Articles are a **PROGRAMME OF MEANS** for the attainment of the Purposes and the carrying out of the Principles mentioned before. These are not unitary. Some of them conflict with each other, some with the Principles and Purposes: but, in the great majority of cases, the means are in harmony with the ends proposed before. The others were exceptional—some of them were felt to be so at the time of making or adopting the Constitution, and hence the opposition to it in both the national and the State Conventions. But, to make clear that the natural and essential Rights of Man are to be carefully respected, to guard the Rights of all men, the Constitution, in one most important particular, secures to the

United States a Right and imposes on them a Duty to watch over the institutions of the individual States, and guarantee to each of them "a Republican form of Government." What do these words mean, in this place? Certainly they guarantee to each State such a Government as will accomplish the Purpose for which the People made the Constitution; and, of course, one which embodies and carries out the Principles that the Revolution was fought to secure. It must be a Government which tends to form "a more perfect Union" amongst all the People; to "establish Justice" for each person; to "insure domestic Tranquillity" everywhere in the land; to "provide for the common Defence" of the natural rights of all men therein; to "promote the general Welfare" of all, the enjoyment "of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and "secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity." It is clear the People contemplate the establishment of such a Government, and nothing less. Words cannot make it more clear.

III. Now, compare Slavery and a Republican Form of Government. Slavery denies the slave all his natural rights; so it is the abnegation of the self-evident Truths of the Programme of Principles. It tends to destroy Union among the people; to establish Injustice; to prevent domestic Tranquillity; to hinder the common Defence; to disturb the General Welfare, and to annihilate the Blessings of Liberty, just so far as it extends: so it is the nullification of the Ends proposed in the Programme of Purposes. Not only is Slavery inconsistent with a Republican form of Government, in the constitutional sense of the word, it is so utterly hostile thereto that the two cannot live together, but one must ultimately destroy the other.

Yet when the Constitution was adopted, almost all the States had slavery within their borders; some of the men who set their names to the paper were themselves slaveholders. But these facts do not alter the meaning of the words, or their power; for we are not concerned with the opinions, or even the intentions of those men, but only with the opinions and intentions of the People of the United States, as expressed in the words of that document. The delegates in the Federal Convention which drafted the Constitution were simply the scriveners of the People, to draw up this Power of Attorney; the delegates to the State Conventions were but the agents to examine it, and

give the People's assent thereto, or withhold it therefrom. The ultimate authority is the People of the United States. I know no act of theirs, at that time, which intimates an intention to keep slavery; or hints that they thought it consistent with the Principles of the Declaration, with the Purposes of the Constitution; or which wrests the words "Republican form of Government" from their plain and natural sense in the Constitution.

Some years ago, the Legislature of Massachusetts made a law forbidding lotteries in the State. Many of the delegates who supported the measure had lottery tickets in their pockets at the moment of voting. Does that fact alter the meaning of the statute? A Massachusetts Legislature prohibited the sale of liquor in the State except for certain specified purposes, and in a manner provided for. Some of the men who voted for the liquor law daily used intoxicating drinks; others rented their shops for the sale their vote made illegal; the law has never been enforced in Boston, the capital of the State,—nay, the traffic has been more open and more extensive ever since. But do these facts alter the intention of the Legislature, and control the words of the statute?

It is now well known that many of the leading men in the Conventions, Federal as well as State, were hostile to slavery. I need only mention Franklin, Washington, Madison, Samuel Adams and John Hancock. What is still more important, it was the general opinion of the People, that Slavery would soon end if let alone, and that it would be better not to kill it violently at once by direct blows, but to let it die of the incurable disease then supposed to be eating its vitals out. So they let it remain in the States, though the Principles of the Declaration, the Purposes of the Constitution, and the Guaranty of a Republican form of Government were all hostile to it. The Northern States one by one removed this shameful exception from their institutions. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, acted with their party, and from time to time did deeds inconsistent with these Principles and Purposes, but their personal convictions still remained unaltered. When Madison and Jefferson read this clause in the preamble of the Constitution, "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," do you believe they limited its application to white men, — to their posterity born free? They expected that slavery would soon end in all the States, and while for the moment they

tolerated it as a Measure of convenience or necessity, which either they would not or else could not then escape from, they yet denied it as a Principle of public policy and morals, and provided a clause in the body of the Constitution which would ultimately destroy it, and that without amending the Constitution itself.

But it is the words of the document we are to consider, not the opinions of contemporaries, or the conduct of individuals, parties, States, or the nation itself. It often happens that a false interpretation of a statute prevails for a long time. James I. knew this, and said, "Let me make the judges, and I care not who makes the laws." The South knows it as well, and as wickedly acts thereon. In 1628, the British Parliament enacted the great Petition of Right to deprive the King of the power of imprisoning men without due process of law. Charles I. asked the judges if that would prevent him from clapping in jail whom he would, without showing cause for it. Judge Hyde answered—"Every law . . . hath its exposition, which is to be left to the courts of justice to determine;" "there is no fear of such a conclusion as is implied in the question." But would that false interpretation by wicked Judges alter the plain meaning of the "great Petition of Right?"

The Common Law of England did not change; under it, men were held as slaves for centuries,—no questions asked; but in the Somerset case, Lord Mansfield fell back on the Principles of English Law, on the Purpose of English Law, and declared that slaves could not breathe in England—so it had been said in the time of Queen Elizabeth. He knew what a change his judgment would make; that it overturned the decision of many judges, the practice of centuries; but he said "*Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.*" Justice was done, and the sky has not caved in yet.

Look a moment more at this Constitutional Guaranty. It is often said, "The People of the United States, as a whole, have no right to meddle with the local institutions of any special State;" that each is "absolutely sovereign." But, then, what does this constitutional guaranty mean? Are these mere words of ceremony? Nobody can believe it. "They are plain, without scruple; absolute, without any saving." Other constitutional provisions also trench upon the local sovereignty of individual States, and were wisely objected to at the time of framing that instrument. The Federal Au-

thority has no right to interfere and establish a Monarchical or an Aristocratic Form of Government, but it is its constitutional Duty to interfere and establish a Republican form of Government. The People wisely contemplated this contingency—that some State should fail to establish such institutions, or carry out the Principles of the Declaration and the Purposes of the Constitution; and so they enacted this very clause, to meet the emergency when it should happen. The words are no more a ceremony than those which declare that Congress shall have power to establish a bankrupt law (Art. I., sec. viii., par. 4;) or to punish treason, (Art. III., sec. iii., par. 2.) Nay, this article goes further—for it *imperatively enjoins the duty*, while they only *confer the power*: it says—"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government." It is not *can*, or *may*, but *shall*; not the word of permission, but of COMMAND!

"A Republican form of Government," says another, "is any Form of Government which a sovereign State sees fit to adopt." Let us suppose, then, that a few rich and educated men in the State of Delaware should have their *Coup d'Etat*, destroy their present institutions, and establish a theocratic despotism, with an absolute Pope, the monarchy hereditary in his family, his children, numerous as those of a Roman Pontiff: that he should be the sole law-giver in the little State, appointing all the local officers, and likewise the one Representative and the two Senators in Congress!—would that be a Republican form of Government? Would Congress allow the creatures of this American Napoleon the Little to sit in the Capitol, as equals of the Democrats from Wisconsin, New York, Ohio, New England? Not a day! Nay, the People of the United States would soon take this Delaware Pope and his one-horse concern of a monarchy, and pitch them into the sea, and establish a Republican form of Government with a rough hand! But which, think you, is most at variance with the Principles of the Declaration and the Purposes of the Constitution—a despotic Papacy, which deprives men only of political and ecclesiastical rights, or Slavery, which deprives men of all rights—ecclesiastical, political, social, domestic, individual?

Make the case still more plain. There are four million slaves in the United States. Suppose they were all gathered into one State, Virginia,—it would not be so densely populated

as the State of New York is now; it would have only about a third as many to the square mile as Massachusetts. Suppose there were only free men enough in the State to rule the slaves,—say forty thousand: suppose they all belonged to one man, Hon. Mr. Firstfamily, and he owned all the real property in the State, made all the laws, and appointed his two Senators and his pack of Representatives to Congress: would Virginia have a Republican form of Government? Would the rest of the nation tolerate that state of things, and allow one man to own four million men, and claim a proportionate power in Congress? The absurdity is evident—self-evident. I make no words on that matter.

Suppose those four million slaves, condensed into that one State, are owned by *two* men, does that alter the case? Certainly not: the difference is only quantitative—not in kind, but degree. Suppose they are all owned by 2000 men, 20,000, 350,000—the actual number of slaveholders—does that alter the case? Not at all; the diffusion of ownership makes no odds in the essence of ownership. Certainly, that State could not have a Republican form of Government when there were 4,000,000 slaves owned by 350,000 masters.

But suppose the slaves are diffused, and the 4,000,000 thus owned by 350,000, are spread over fifteen States, does that make any difference in the Principle? Not the smallest in the world. If it be not consistent with the Declaration of Independence and with the Constitution for one man to own 4,000,000 men in a single State, and in virtue of that ownership to appoint all the delegates therefrom to Congress; then it is not consistent for 350,000 men to own 4,000,000 in fifteen States, and in virtue of that ownership to have a proportionate share in ruling the nation. It is no more consistent for the 350,000 to own one man, and debar him from those natural rights which Governments are instituted to secure, which the Revolution was fought to protect, and the Constitution framed to establish, than it is for one man to own 4,000,000.

But, if the matter is not yet quite clear, take one illustration more. In New England we have a celebrated Democrat, who has held high offices, civil and military, under all the parties which have been in power since my boyhood. He declares that our fathers made a great mistake in setting up a Democracy with equal rights and universal suffrage: they ought to have founded a limited monarchy,

with an established church, a hereditary peerage, and its appropriate garnish. This famous man is just now alike the champion of Slavery and the Democratic party. Let us suppose he should preserve his historical continuity of deceit, and betray his new conditors as he has all his former helpers and friends — Whig, Free Soil, and Republican; that he, with other men to aid him, should subdue all the untrified Democrats of Massachusetts, including the new converts, which the late revival of administrative Democracy has brought in at the eleventh hour, or only five minutes before twelve — hoping likewise to get “every man his penny” of national plunder; suppose he should enslave them all, and likewise all the Know Nothings of the State; such as were born Know Nothings, them also that were made Know Nothings of men, and such likewise as have made themselves Know Nothings for the kingdom of earth’s sake; suppose he should, moreover, enslave the foreign population, and reduce all these three great parties — Democrats, Know Nothings, and Foreigners, to “chattels personal to all intents, uses, and purposes whatsoever.” There are a quarter of a million Foreigners: the Democrats, with their families, are at least as numerous; and, according to the census of the Know Nothing voters, made by their late Governor, — whose reputation for veracity is beyond all question, — there must be in the State at least 400,000, “to a mathematical certainty.” Suppose the figures are correct, and this conqueror, by his *Coup d’Etat*, gains him 900,000 slaves, all of them white men, which he distributes among 1000 of his fellows. Massachusetts has then a population of 900,000 slaves, and 300,000 or 400,000 freemen. Suppose, further, that the 1000 slaveholders of Massachusetts, following the example of Virginia, desist from commerce and manufactures, let the fisheries slide, and pay little heed even to agriculture; but make it their chief business to breed white slaves for sale. And as, by the action of England, and other powers of Christendom, the African slave trade declines, suppose Massachusetts acquires the monopoly of the business, has no competitor in the Atlantic, and sells her white chattels into bondage at Cuba and Brazil, as Virginia sends the particolored descendants of her first families to Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and a market. Suppose our Democrat, old in apostatizing, becomes the King of Massachusetts — absolute monarch — “crushes out” all Freedom of the Press, the

Pulpit, the Pen, the Lip, or the Hand; appoints his servants to the local and the national offices; and sends appropriate men to represent him in the Capitol — would Congress admit them there? would they consider that Massachusetts had a Republican Form of Government? We all know what the decision would be. But is it more anti-republican to reduce men to bondage than to keep them in it? Is it conformable to the self-evident truths of the Declaration to enslave a black man and not a white man? Is it consistent with the purposes of the Constitution to raise Africans for market in Virginia, and inconsistent therewith to raise Irishmen, Democrats, Know Nothings, for sale in Massachusetts? If the Constitution allows Virginia to deprive a single innocent black man of his natural right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, then it must equally allow Massachusetts also to rob white men of what the Revolution was fought to secure to both white and black.

Take another case. The Declaration of Independence sets forth the People’s right to destroy an oppressive Government, and establish a new one, which shall secure their safety and happiness. But neither in that paper, nor yet in the Constitution do the People say that ethnologic origin or cutaneous color, affects the self-evident Rights of themselves and their posterity. Now, in South Carolina there are 395,000 Black men, and 274,000 White ones. The Africans have 121,000 majority in the State, but are wickedly oppressed. Suppose that majority should make a special application of this Principle of the Declaration, and should put the Blacks where the Whites are now — making them “chattels personal to all intents, uses, and purposes whatsoever,” and claim the additional number of Representatives in Congress on that account: would the Democrats acknowledge that South Carolina had a “Republican form of Government,” when such a majority enslaved such a minority? But if “what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander,” then what is a “Republican form of Government” for the White minority to enslave the Black majority withal, must be at least equally “Republican” for the majority to enslave the minority by?

Extreme cases make shipwreck of false interpretations; they are the roadstead where just principles can ride secure, to embark their ergo, or unload their freight. If we define a Republican form of Government by the Constitu-

tution, and the Declaration, which is its pre-existent Cause,—then it is evident it must conform to the Revolutionary Programme of Principles, and the Constitutional Programme of Purposes. It must be a Government which secures all men in their natural, unalienable, and equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: such and such only! Now, as slavery is the denial of all these rights to the enslaved—as it makes the substance of the bondman an accident of the master—it is plain that slavery is utterly incompatible with a Republican form of Government; that no slave State has a Republican form of Government; that there are fifteen States in this Union to which the Federal Power has not performed the Constitutional Duty which it is solemnly bound to perform. Any slave in the Union has a Constitutional claim that Congress shall fulfil this obligation—set him free, and secure his natural, unalienable, and equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But there is one argument more against this definition of Republican form of Government —viz., this: “The classic and the mediæval Republics allowed slavery—therefore it is not inconsistent with a Republic now—nay, it is indispensably necessary; there can be no Republic without slavery.” But these ancient governments had no such Declaration of Principles and Purposes as our fathers started with; they laid down no great platform of natural Rights for all men. The argument for slavery derived from the constitution of those ancient governments is of no more value than the similar argument from their rapacity, their cruelty, or their oppression of the Plebeians at Rome, who were yet not slaves. The degradation of man in the ancient republics is no more to be copied as essential to that form of Government than the degradation of woman. A constitutional representative Democracy did not exist in the old times. Abuses in Greece, in Italy, in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, are no universal warrant for wickedness in America. I know there are men in Virginia and South Carolina, who quote Aristotle and Cicero in favor of American slavery; they seem to have read the translations of these authors only to get arguments against the Natural Rights of Mankind. Similar men have studied the Old Testament but to find out that Abraham was a slaveholder, that Moses authorized bondage; they have read the New only to find divine inspiration in the

words of Paul, which they wrest into this: “Slaves, obey your masters!” If they have both the Hebrew and the Christian Religion and the Spirit of Humanity against them, they have the Hon. Edward Everett on their side.

Besides, in a progressive People there must be a Progressive Interpretation of many institutions and statutes. Thus the Common Law of England did not change, but ship-money became illegal; and slavery perished by an interpretation. No number of decisions by learned Judges, no royal usage, no popular acquiescence for centuries, could withstand the demand for natural Justice made by the increased knowledge, virtue and humanity of the progressive People. At London, Mr. Bernard has just been tried under laws which have put the halter round a hundred necks; no doubt he did the deed charged on him, but a London Jury righteously acquits the man. The Chief Justice of the King’s Bench, who presided at the trial, in another post, has done much to promote this moralization of the law, by expounding it to suit the humane spirit of an enlightened age, and the moral purpose of Law itself, which, as Hooker says, “has its seat in the bosom of God.”

But I need not cross the seas for examples of this progressive moralization of institutions and of statutes. In the Amendments to the Constitution, Art. VIII., it is provided that “cruel and unusual punishments shall not be inflicted.” If Congress should decree the punishment of crucifixion against all who aid a fugitive slave, could that torture be justified as neither cruel nor yet “unnatural,” because it had been common in the Roman “Republic,” or because Alexander—the pupil of Aristotle, the most thinking man in the most democratic of ancient “Republics”—for no offence at all, once crucified two thousand captive Tyrians in a single day? In the time when the People made the Constitution, some of the States punished certain offences by branding with a hot iron, by cropping the ears, and other mutilations even more atrocious. Suppose Congress should pass a law inflicting the most odious of those tortures on defaulters, on members of Congress who bribe the President openly to vote against the well-known principles of Justice, is there any man who would justify that punishment by declaring that once it was “usual,” and could not now be considered “cruel”? No doubt there are

such men in New York ; I know there are in Boston — but the People do not go to the cess-pools of society to find a test of right and wrong.

I think the form of indenture for apprentices to the business of the goldsmith in England, as far back as the 14th century, provided that the youth should receive "sufficient instruction." Suppose a lad is apprenticed now by the same form of indenture, and the master gives him just that amount of "instruction" which was "sufficient" for a goldsmith's apprentice then, and no more : is there a jury in America that would justify the master's neglect on the technical plea that he had done all "the worshipful company of Goldsmiths in London" would require, five hundred years ago ?

If, in Boston, a surgeon should amputate a lady's arm at the elbow, and plunge the stump in boiling pitch to stanch the blood, and she should die of the operation, and he were indicted for manslaughter, could he justify his malpractice by showing that such was the common method before the time of Hippocrates, and was recommended by that great master of the healing art ?

In Article I. of the Amendments to the Constitution, it is provided that Congress shall not prohibit *the free exercise of religion*. The District of Columbia is under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress. There are Catholics in it. Suppose a company of Catholics should burn a heretic alive, as they have done many a thousand times, and as some of their writers declare they will again, as soon as they have the power, could they justify themselves on the ground that it was a part of their religion to do so ; quote the old English statute *de Hæretico comburendo*, and adduce a long list of precedents, running back to the fifth century, and appeal to this clause of the Constitution ?

Suppose the present "revival of religion" should work southward, and by some "special miracle" should incline the heart of one of the great Southern Senators who are champions of slavery to a particular act of his new zeal. Suppose he should sacrifice his son as a burnt-offering ; let us suppose it was not his only son, not even the son of his wife, but of a bond woman — the Patriarch is imitated in more particulars than one. When brought to trial for the wilful murder, could he justify it by appealing to this clause of the Constitution, declaring it was in the *free exercise of his religion* that he did the deed, following the example

of the mythical Patriarch, to whom the mere intention was "imputed for righteousness;" and declaring that he who had done the deed was as much more "righteous" than Abraham as Works are better than Faith, which cannot be seen without them ? I doubt that a jury would acquit him on that constitutional defense, for there has been some little progress in the idea of Religion since the days when it was thought that God delighted in human sacrifice !

Our own institutions are continually modified by the spirit of the age, nay, even by the party that controls the nation for the time. Need I mention the conflicting judgments of Exponents of the Constitution in regard to a Bank, a Protective Tariff, Internal Improvements, and the like ? "Contemporary exposition," says the maxim, "is the strongest of all." It is only a rope of sand, which binds no man. Jefferson's "exposition" was old enough to be "contemporary" in law ; he thought the Constitution did not justify the acquisition of new territory, and recommended an amendment to save the purchase of Louisiana. Who believes it now ? It has been the settled practice as well as the consistent theory of the American Government, to regard colored freemen as citizens of the United States. All at once, the Supreme Court repels the "contemporary exposition," and overthrows the established principles of law. There has been a progressive demoralization of the Constitution, and no wonder men should cry out against a plain application of one of its most valuable provisions !

Of course, I do not suppose that this guaranty of a Republican form of Government applies merely to the liberation of slaves : one day, the humanity and knowledge of the age will decide that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself are adequate to secure the natural rights of WOMEN not less than men. But let us take one step at a time ; so shall we be ready for the next.

It is not only unconstitutional, it is also most dangerous to admit that Slavery is consistent with a Republican form of Government. The South claims a constitutional right to that anti-republican institution. In her own affairs, the North decides against it, and casts it away with scorn and loathing : but she forgets the sacred obligation of the Constitution — its solemn guarantees — and allows the minority of the South to have their wicked

way at home. See the pernicious consequences.

1. In each Southern State there has grown up a hateful Oligarchy, a Few-Men power; it is not an Aristocracy—the rule of the best,—but a Kakistocracy—the rule of the worst,—of the worst rules of conduct, if not the worst conductors. There is a privileged class, with the odious monopoly of making property of men.

2. The few slaveholders rule the majority in all the Southern States;—they own the blacks, they overpower the poor whites. While enriching themselves, they yet impoverish the community and the State; they hinder education; they debauch and demoralize the People.

3. They control the nation. It is their creatures who hold the Federal offices, and rule the North. They invade the local rights of the Northern States—in the examples I have already given, and many more. If the North makes the law, the South appoints the judges, who can unmake it by their exposition. The Supreme Court is a *judicial revolver* in the Southern hand—or is it, rather, only a Bludgeron, to strike Freedom down?

It is painful to see the increase of central power, and the decay of local self-government. Northern State rights are trod down to the dust beneath the hoof of the Federal power. Slavery is the cause of this vicious centralization. Since the Alien and Sedition laws were made, intended to gag men, I think of no advance towards despotism, except what has been made by the Slave Power to defend and greater its peculiar institution. The guarantee of a Republican form of Government is a security against centralization of power. It is the People's command to establish local self-government in every State by the Principles of the Declaration, and for the Purposes of the Constitution.

Northern men are strangely unfaithful. They do not attack slavery itself. I think there is now no political party in the United States which declares itself hostile to slavery. It is only the incidents or the accidents of slavery which the Republican party opposes. They cry out against "Extension of slavery," not against the Existence of slavery itself. So they have measures without a Principle. Commissioner Loring, while Judge of Probate for Suffolk County, kidnapped a man, and sent him back to slavery; he put off the widows and orphans who came to his Court,

thinking the sacrifice of a man was more to be desired than mercy, or even justice. The People of the State were moved with indignation, and sought to hurl the unjust Judge from the office he disgraced. After many delays, shufflings and dodgings, the matter was brought before a Republican Governor, who removed him, but took pains to declare that he did not do this because Mr. Loring had kidnapped a man—"no official opinion of his entering into my consideration of the question, and no official act constituting an element in the judgment I have formed."

Thus the Republican party fails to satisfy the moral sense of the People, and to command the respect of the merely thoughtful, who, if they do not feel justly or love mercy, can yet see inconsistency, and despise Measures which are bottomed on no Principle; and scorn the men who are false alike to their moral convictions and their official opportunities. Thus in the late Presidential campaign the party nominated for its champion a man never before identified with its principles, or even devoted to its measures. Hence, fortunate for itself, it was defeated. No Political Party has yet a platform high enough to command a full view of the field, or lift its representatives up to such a moral elevation as shall draw the eyes of all good men.

It is clear what we ought to do—the North must declare "SLAVERY NOT TO BE TOLERATED IN A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT. NO PROPERTY IN MAN. IMMEDIATE ABOLITION. NO SLAVE STATE IN THE UNION." We shall come to that by and by, not all at once—little by little—step by step, not by a jump. *Nihil saltatim, gradatim omne*, is good Latin. Already the People look that way. What they want is a LEADER, who is not only intellectually sharp, but also morally just. Mere intellect, looking only after what is profitable for to-day, can never see Justice, God's idea of what is profitable to all men, and forever; while yet a conscientious woman will know it at once, and can give the counsel which would save a State. The nice ear, laid to the ground, hears the airy footstep of the thunder, when a great ways off; yet it never sees the Rainbow, close at hand, which yet every clear-eyed boy in the farmer's barnyard looks on with wonder, delighted at that handsome angel who tells him the storm is over and gone. Each faculty has its function; those of cunning and conscience are not the same.

In 1787, the People of the United States tolerated slavery as a Measure; all the States had it then, save Massachusetts, alone, as I think — though Mr. Hale adds also New Hampshire, and I wish he may be as correct here as he is commonly right elsewhere. But the People of the United States never admitted slavery as a Principle. So, not only in the Declaration do they lay down maxims, the norm of Institutions, and in the Constitution, the norm of Statutes and Customs, do they also propose purposes utterly destructive of Property in Man; but in the Constitution they would not tolerate the word Slave or Bondman, lest they should be thought to admit as a permanent Principle of Politics, what they only tolerated for the moment as a Measure of Necessity.

But, after the People, in their weakness or wickedness, allowed slavery as a Measure, then the Southern States got possession of the Government, claimed that slavery was a Principle, a Constitutional Principle, a Republican Principle, nay, a necessary Principle, and developed it into numerous measures hostile to the self-evident Truths our fathers fought for, and subversive of all the great Purposes for which they built the Union up. Slavery is a Principle — the special Principle of the Southern States — the distinctive Shibboleth thereof. It is the Principle of Despotism; also of national ruin.

But Freedom is also a Principle — the distinctive Principle of our Revolutionary and our Constructive Purpose. The two cannot long continue in the same Government. The People cannot go backwards to Slavery, and the despotic ruin which that abuts on; and at the same time go forward to Freedom, and the manifold welfare it leads to. America cannot have Regress and Progress at the same time.

There is one great Political question before the American People — "Is Slavery consistent with the Republican form of Government which the Revolution was fought to secure, and the Union established to found?" Parties represent the tendencies of the People. They are crucial experiments, guide-boards, to point this way or that. There is no political party whose finger indicates the road to that true Republican Government which shall realize the Principles and Purposes of those great documents of the People. It is only on this Anti-

Slavery platform that those gravest of all matters can be now discussed; nowhere else are they looked fairly in the face. But still the question forces itself into the Politics of the nation, of every State, of each considerable town, nay, into all the theological sects. The slaveholders and their vassals, North and South, loudly declare, "Slavery is essential to the Republican form of Government." The rest of the nation feel that Freedom is the essential of a Republic, yea, of all continuous Progress, and of all sure Welfare; but they dare not say so yet.

What cowards we are! Hence the best institutions of the North are an object of continual attack. The South (I mean the slaveholders) hate the North, hate her Republican Principles, hate her Democratic Purposes, hate her Progress, hate her Welfare, hate her best men! They seek to ruin us. Forty years ago, they made a tariff to ruin the commerce of the North; then they unmade it, to ruin our manufactures. The Senatorial executive repeals the Bounty paid to the Northern fisheries; Mr. Boyce, of South Carolina, proposes to abolish all custom-houses, and collect the nation's revenue by a direct tax. I also wish his plan might succeed, and will do all in my little power to help the work. But while I would recommend this as a great Principle of Democracy, which will deprive the Federal Government of the means of corruption, the Hon. Senator from the State of Bully Brooks and Keitt designs it only as an oligarchic Measure of Revenge, meant to harm the North. That stone thrown into the air would fall back on the Southern head, and destroy half the army and navy of the nation, and crush out of sight I know not how many political office-holders.

I say the power of the Federal Government strengthens at the expense of the Northern States. Every increase of that central power enlarges the courage, the strength, and the malignant insolence of your Southern masters. Listen to Senator Hammond: the New England men are slaves; you and I are slaves; but, alas! we have no masters bound to take care of us when sick and old! Compare the last four Administrations — that of Polk, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan; see with what accelerated velocity they descend towards slavery.

What efforts have been made by the Slave Power to prevent the people of Kansas from establishing a Republican form of Government! what monstrous money has been spent

to enslave Kansas! what efforts are making still! The battle between Freedom and Slavery is now waging there. The question is now before her People, "Will you make a Republican form of Government, or take the Anti-Republican which the Slave Power seeks to force on you with the bayonet?" The Measure is of great importance, the Principle of yet more. There are two plans of action for the people there to choose between.

I. The wicked plan — to accept the Leecompton Constitution, take the bribe of English's Bill, come into the Union as a slave State; then repudiate that Constitution, and make a new one prohibiting slavery. This course will be recommended by political jobbers, land-speculators, and many men who "have axes to grind;" but it is wrong, it is impracticable, and liable to defeat at every step; it is not likely to succeed, and is disgraceful if it prosper.

II. The just plan — to vote down the Leecompton Constitution, repudiate English's Bill, organize under the new Leavenworth Constitution, and appeal to the freemen of the North. There will be no violence offered by the Federal Government. A new election of Representatives to Congress takes place next autumn. Then the Northern men who voted for Mr. English's Bill to force the Leecompton Constitution on Kansas, will go where they who voted for Mr. Douglas's Kansas-Nebraska Bill were driven at the subsequent elections. The new House of Representatives will come together in December, 1859, fresh from the People. Some advantageous changes will have taken place in the Senate; Unitary New England will count twelve in the column of Freedom! Kansas will apply for admission as a free State; Mr. Buchanan, unpopular, defeated, despised, going out of power, will not be able to scare men, coax, or even to buy them as now. The House of Representatives will accept the new State, and offer a richer dowry than the Slave Power now tries to tempt her with. The Senate will seek to settle the Kansas difficulty before the Presidential election of the next year, and so will gladly admit her. Kansas will lose nothing but a little time, and that loss will be a gain to the Anti-Slavery party of the North.

Within a few days, Minnesota has become a State; Oregon will soon come within the ring; Kansas cannot long be kept out. All these will be Anti-Slavery States. While ter-

ritories, they are necessarily kept tied to the politics of the administration party; but when independent States, their individual character will straightway appear. Soon there will be a majority of Senators hostile to Slavery. I think we shall never see another slave State added to the Union, nor another slave-President defiling the Capitol. After long waiting for "something to turn up," Mr. Everett, it seems, if I understand his actions and words, has now nominated himself for the highest American office, and put himself on the country. Guided by the "Southern matron," — a woman from the Bludgeon State, who had never a husband or even a child, — this professional rhetorician has gone down to the electioneering deep to do business in great waters. With the cold lead of his charity sermon for sinker, and a small piece of General Washington's dead body as bait, he casts his line upon all waters, bobbing for the Presidency! But, alas! I think he will toil all the night of his old age, and catch nothing, for the South has just repealed the bounty on Northern fishery! Instead of the spoils of that deep, he will take only an "anodyne," and serve but to "point a moral and adorn a tale." No, Mr. Chairman, I think we shall never have another slavery-President. That creature has been weighed in the balance, and found wanting; his days are numbered, and will be finished soon. No victory of the Slave Power ensures to the permanent advantage of that Power. The Mexican War, the Fugitive Slave Bill, the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, the English Bill, they are four jumps of the frog in the well — each time he went up a foot, but slid down three more before he leaped again! Slave-President Pierce came into power with a vast majority — he went out with more; slave-President Buchanan could not get the People's vote, — he is a minority President! But what power he had last December, a majority of twenty-two in the House of Representatives! What is it now? Where will it be in December, 1859? — where will he and his party be in December, 1860?

Slavery is immoral; it is also unconstitutional. It must be put down by the social action of the People — if not by Local Self-government in the Southern States, then by the Federal Arm of the whole nation — peaceably if they will, forcibly if we must.

The work of Abolition is moral in its substance; it is likewise political in its form. While from the stand-point of individual con-

science, slavery is a **WRONG** — what ministers call a **SIN** — from that of American Politics, it is the denial of a Republican form of Government, that is, a repudiation of the Principles and Purposes of the American People, solemnly set forth in both the Revolutionary and the Constructive Programme — the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

All Federal officers hold place under the Power of Attorney which the People swear them on; by that, Congress has no authority to establish slavery in any territory, to protect it in any territory, or to allow it in any State; the President has none, the Supreme Court has none.

Not a man in the United States is Constitutionally a slave; for the language of that Power of Attorney is imperative — the People command: “the United States SHALL guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government.”

I often hear it asserted, by wise and good men, that the American People never will abolish slavery. They do not mean, I take it, the “never” of eternity, but the never of a very long period, say a thousand or five hundred years. Now look at this. Within the last three hundred and forty years, three great questions have come up before the Anglo-Saxon People.

I. The first was the question of the 16th century. It was this — Shall the Pope of Rome rule the British Church, after his own sort, or shall the British People rule that Church, — determine its doctrines, define its forms, and control its practice? At first, it seemed as if the British People must certainly succumb to the Roman Pope, for in his hand he had the armies, the treasure, the learning, the talent of Europe; the public opinion of the world was on his side. It took more than half a century, well-nigh a whole hundred years, to settle that great question, and then the Pope was cast out from the four seas of England: and from that day to this, he has been a heretic in Britain. That was the question of the 16th century in England, and thus did our fathers meet and answer it there.

II. In the 17th century, there came another question, equally terrible. It was this — Shall the Stuart kings control the British State, or shall it be amenable to the British People,—

King, Lords and Commons, with a Constitution bottomed on the People’s consent? Here, too, there was an immense power opposed to the People, for the Stuarts had possession of the throne; they had the armies, the institutions, the talent, the treasure. The quarrel began in 1603, when James the First came to the crown; it did not end until 1688, when Britain cast James the Second clear over the sea: his family have been “Pretenders” ever since. That strife lasted more than four score years, and it was decided in favor of progress, liberty, and the rights of man.

But to settle that question, some of the ablest and most thoughtful and progressive families of England must flee from their native land, and here find a home in the wilderness. So, while this question was getting settled, the American Colonies were at the same time getting planted. They grew up under the shadow of the American forest, wherein they started with nothing but their manhood in them, and the wilderness about them.

In the 18th century, they had grown a great and powerful people, then esteemed some two or three millions strong.

III. Then came the third great question,—that of the 18th century, namely — Shall the American People be controlled by the British King and Parliament, or shall they make their own laws and found their own institutions, such as suit alike the instinct and the reflection of the People?

Here, too, it seemed as if the power was all on one side, and only all the Right on the other; for the British King had the navy and the army, he had the offices, the institutions, the church and the treasure, and of course he had the means to buy up young ambition, and control much energetic talent. That quarrel began openly about 1758, and it was not settled until 1783. But here, too, the same spirit prevailed, and the American People answered that question as all the three others had been settled, in favor of progress and the rights of man.

Now, in the 19th century, with the same race of men, there comes up this terrible question, likewise to be passed on by the People,—Shall the American Republic be a Democracy, guaranteeing to every man his “natural, essential, unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” or shall it degenerate down into a despotism, where property in man is recognized as sacred, and

that despotism spread itself until every foot-step of Democracy is wiped clean out of the continent?

Now, as before, the chances seem to be against us; for the Slave Power has got possession of the Government, it controls the Church likewise, it has the army and navy, it holds the mighty treasure of this continent; and it has the means to buy up young ambition, and take aspiring talent in its hand. But the Anglo-Saxon blood is still the same as it was in the 18th century, in the 17th, in the 16th, and it will decide this question as each of those others,—in favor of progress and the rights of man. A nation, a great tribe of men, does not lose its historic continuity of action, unless it grows feeble either by natural or premature decay, ormingles an excess of other ethnological elements in its veins, and so corrupts its blood and perishes. The American People has done neither the one nor the other. It is not old enough either maturely or prematurely to perish by decay, and it has not yet filtered bad blood enough into its veins to change its character. Depend upon it, we shall do as our great grandfathers did in Britain in the 16th century; as our grandfathers in Britain did in the 17th century; and as our fathers in America did in the 18th century. If the Slave Power retreat, it will be come up with and run over; if it stand still, it will be trodden down; if it advance against the Progressive columns of Mankind, it will be met and dashed to pieces. Its Nature of wickedness is its manifest Destiny of Ruin.

But, alas! each of those three great questions was settled by war. Yet it seemed at first the evil might be abolished by peaceful arbitrament. Surely, there were historical precedents and theological doctrines enough in the 16th century to have given the People of Britain control over their own church; in the 17th century, there was law enough to secure Britain a constitutional and limited government; and in the 18th century, our fathers had enough charters, statutes, customs on their side, and still more, enough Right, to enable them to settle the question, we should suppose, peacefully, and without drawing the sword. But the party that was to be overcome, the party that must yield, in the 16th century, in the 17th, in the 18th, was the same that held the purse in its left hand, and the sword in its right hand; and when did such a party ever yield until that purse was clutched back, and that sword was violently wrenched

away and taken to cleave the tyrant down from crown to groin? Never yet.

The time, I think, has passed by when the great American question of the 19th century could have been settled without bloodshed. In 1850 it was possible. It may be that in 1854, when the Kansas-Nebraska question was before Congress, there was still a chance for a peaceful settlement of the matter. But as that opportunity has been lost, and the ambition of the Slave Power has become so greatly increased, I think now this terrible question must be settled, as all the preceding ones, by violence and the sword. I deplore it exceedingly. I hate war, but injustice worse than war. Had I lived in the 16th century, I would have entreated the Pope; and when he would not be supplicated with words, I would have persuaded him with the battle-axe. In the 17th century, I would have argued, and quoted Magna Charta, customs, statutes; and when the Tyrant would not yield, I would have shown him, what Cromwell also taught, that kings, too, had a joint in their necks, and that the People could find it. In the 18th century, I would have petitioned, and remonstrated, and cast "myself at the foot of the throne," as our fathers did; but when spurned from that throne, I would have done as they did, cast my pewter spoons and platters into bullets, sold my last load of hay to buy a musket, beaten my ploughshare into a sword, and said, "Liberty first, ploughing afterwards." So, in the 19th century, sad as it is, I think we must come at last to that same issue. I have confidence in the Justice of mankind, but WRATH is the flaming sword with which man so often fights the battles of Humanity.

New England, Massachusetts—I do not know what there is in her blood, but there is this in her history, that all the great ideas which have made their fortune in America, and which at the same time have also made America's fortune, they are New England ideas—Massachusetts ideas. There was something in the blood of those Puritans who planted themselves on these shores, which gave their descendants a Power of Ideas and a Power of Action, such as no people before our time has ever had. It was Massachusetts that took the initiative in the great strife of the 18th century; here are the early monuments of the Revolutionary victory. It is the same Massachusetts that has taken the initiative in the greater strife of the 19th century.

ry ; here are the battle fields of the Anti-Slavery Revolution,—they also will be one day beautiful with monuments of victory. Wherever the Platform of Freedom is laid down, it is New-England men, Massachusetts men, who stand up thereon. It may be in New York, in Washington, in Cincinnati, in Philadelphian, in California,—no matter where, it is New England blood that is there ; it is the voice of Massachusetts that speaks. Here too, this great work began, here let the first decisive step be taken.

There are two things I want Massachusetts to do. A few years ago, Charles Sumner was nailed at in the Senate because he had sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and was asked how he could do that. He said, "I support the Constitution of the United States *as I understand the Constitution of the United States.*" They then asked him, "Would you do this thing ?" "Yes." "Would you do that thing ?" "Yes ?" "Would you return a fugitive slave ?" I think it was Mr. Mason or some of his coadjutors who asked that question,—and Mr. Sumner said, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing ?" There spoke the old manly spirit of Massachusetts ! It will be writ on his monument one day—letters of gold on whitest stone. Now, I want the State of Massachusetts to say to the Union, "Is thy servant a dog, that she should return a fugitive slave ?"

1. I want Massachusetts to pass a law, next winter, declaring that no fugitive slave shall ever be returned from her soil, but whatsoever fugitive slave sets his foot here, that fugitive slave is free, and the arm of Massachusetts which holds the sword, shall be stretched out over that man, and strike down whoever strikes at him. There is a resolution before this body which looks to that very purpose ; and next autumn there will be a petition circulated before the People of Massachusetts, asking the Legislature to do that thing. I hope

every man of you will put your name to it : I know every woman will ; for the conscience of woman outruns the prudence and the cunning of man : I would follow her conscience rather than his cunning. Let us declare a Kidnapper's Court a "Nuisance," to be abated as other nuisances, with the rough, swift hand of the People. I say that solemnly, knowing what I say.

2. Then, I want the Legislature to instruct our Senators and request our Representatives in Congress to use all their influence to fulfil the guaranty in the 4th article of the Constitution, and secure "a Republican form of Government to every State in this Union."

We have asked many things of the dear old Commonwealth before now,—always things unpopular at first. She gave us a patient hearing, listened, and has been convinced that we only outrun the public conscience a little. So she has granted almost every request we have ever made of her. We did not come before an unjust Judge, neither fearing God nor regarding man, who complied with our petition only to be rid of our complaint. We appealed to a thoughtful and considerate People, who granted our desire when they both felt and saw that we asked only Justice, the common Right of all, which is likewise the common Interest of each. Dear old State—she will comply with our request in this matter also; not perhaps at once, but at length. *Nihil saltatim, gradatim omne.*

Let Massachusetts do these two things, and you will see presently the other New England States follow. New York, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, even Illinois, and Indiana, and Pennsylvania, will presently take the same ground ; and if we go on in this way, it will not be long before slavery is abolished in this nation ; and when the Declaration of Independence is read on the Fourth of July, 1876, there will not be a slave in the United States. Then what a future is before us !